



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING


RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

July 23, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Receive the Report on the 2010-2011 Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has, since 2000, initiated several changes in the procedures for reviewing and approving teacher preparation programs in order to assure the state's programs continue to advance in quality.

The Title II, Section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) requires that each state establish criteria and identify and assist teacher preparation institutions which are not performing at a satisfactory level. States must also report annually to the United States Department of Education (USED) a statement of its procedure, along with a list of low-performing and at-risk teacher preparation institutions.

The Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) developed, and on October 9, 2007 the State Board of Education (SBE) approved with amendments a set of procedures which reflect the overall effectiveness of preparation programs using multiple factors. Criteria within the procedures include weighted components from earlier reviews of institutional programs, the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) test scores, new teacher efficacy surveys, supervisor validation of new teachers' efficacy, program completion rates, and additional consideration for the program's mission which is responsive to the state's teacher preparation needs. Attachment A shows the 2010-2011 performance score for each approved teacher preparation institution in the state, not including institutions yet to receive probationary SBE approval. Attachment B is the criteria and formula used for identifying performance.

The MDE will report the institutions identified as at-risk or low-performing to the USED per HEA requirements. The MDE plans for corrective action, support, and penalties were approved by the SBE on September 9, 2009. Institutions identified

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

JOHN C. AUSTIN – PRESIDENT • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH – VICE PRESIDENT
NANCY DANHOF – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
RICHARD ZEILE – NASBE DELEGATE • KATHLEEN N. STRAUS
DANIEL VARNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

as low-performing have two years to improve their performance before further state sanctions occur. Institutions identified as at-risk must progress to the satisfactory category within two years or move to the low-performing category, even if their calculated performance score would result in at-risk level. Institutions have two years from that date to remove at-risk or low-performing status without moving to the next lower level.

Based on the last three years of reports from 2008-09 to 2010-11 (Attachment C) the following classifications are identified:

Moved from At-Risk to Exemplary

- Alma College (Removed from corrective action)

Moved from At-Risk to Satisfactory

- University of Detroit Mercy (Removed from corrective action)

Moved from Satisfactory to Exemplary:

- Michigan Technological University (non-corrective action status)
- Robert B. Miller

Moved from Exemplary to Satisfactory:

- Central Michigan University (non-corrective action status)
- Eastern Michigan University (non-corrective action status)

Moved from Satisfactory to At-Risk:

- Western Michigan University (corrective action level 1)

Moved from Exemplary to At-Risk:

- Hillsdale College (corrective action level 1)
- Saginaw Valley State University (corrective action level 1)

Remained in Low-Performing for a second year:

- Adrian College (Currently in second year of corrective action)
- Lake Superior State University (Currently in third year of corrective action)

Remained in Low-Performing for a third year:

- Olivet College (Currently in second year of corrective action)

Aggregate data at the level of the institution will be reported on the MDE website along with the public MTTC scores. Attachment D shows the corrective action status of institutions effective with this report. Attachment E is the explanation of the various levels of corrective action.

For the academic year 2011-12, teacher preparation institutions were expected to submit evidence of seeking and using feedback from principals regarding new teachers' preparation. No points are currently associated with this data.

As requested by members of the SBE during the August 9, 2011, meeting Attachment F shows each institution's reporting of the number of candidates eligible for recommendation for a teaching certificate and the number of endorsements recommended in each high need content area.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education receive the report on the 2010-11 Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores, as discussed in the Superintendent's Memorandum dated July 23, 2012.

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores for the 2010-11 Report																		
Institution / Category	Overall Score	MTTC 30		Teacher Exit Surveys 5			Supervisor Surveys 5			Program Completion Rate 10		Program Review Status 10		Diversity 5		High Need Content 5		Principal Feedback Rcvd.
		%	Points	%	%	Points	%	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	
EXEMPLARY																		
Hope ¹	70	96	30	96	100	5	98	100	5	90	10	100	10	10	5	58	5	Yes
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	70	96	30	88	100	5	94	88	5	90	10	100	10	18	5	67	5	Yes
Calvin	68	94	30	94	100	5	100	100	5	90	10	100	10	7	3	54	5	Yes
Grand Valley State University	68	93	30	94	99	5	93	98	5	92	10	100	10	6	3	51	5	Yes
Robert B Miller	68	95	30	96	100	5	94	85	5	82	8	100	10	15	5	46	5	Yes
Alma	66	90	30	92	100	5	92	100	5	89	8	100	10	6	3	46	5	Yes
Madonna	66	91	30	94	100	5	100	100	5	89	8	100	10	9	3	56	5	Yes
Michigan State University	66	92	30	92	100	5	94	81	5	87	8	100	10	9	3	59	5	Yes
Cornerstone	65	90	30	93	100	5	94	86	5	91	10	100	10	4	0	46	5	Yes
Northern Michigan University	65	92	30	97	100	5	98	100	5	93	10	100	10	4	0	65	5	Yes
U of M-Dearborn	65	86	25	94	100	5	98	85	5	93	10	100	10	14	5	112	5	Yes
Albion	63	93	30	95	100	5	100	100	5	92	10	100	10	5	3	18	0	No
Andrews	63	87	25	93	100	5	96	100	5	86	8	100	10	44	5	61	5	Yes
Aquinas	63	92	30	89	97	5	97	84	5	85	8	100	10	2	0	48	5	Yes
Michigan Technological University	63	90	30	84	100	5	98	100	5	85	8	100	10	0	0	111	5	Yes
Oakland	63	87	25	94	100	5	96	90	5	94	10	100	10	6	3	55	5	Yes
Spring Arbor	63	85	25	94	98	5	95	96	5	92	10	100	10	6	3	41	5	Yes
Wayne State University	63	86	25	97	98	5	97	86	5	84	8	100	10	26	5	46	5	Yes

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores for the 2010-11 Report (Cont.)

Institution / Category	Overall Score	MTTC 30		Teacher Exit Surveys 5			Supervisor Surveys 5			Program Completion Rate 10		Program Review Status 10		Diversity 5		High Need Content 5		Principal Feedback Rcvd.
				Eff.	Resp.		Eff.	Resp.		(Cohort)								
		%	Points	%	%	Points	%	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	
SATISFACTORY																		
Central Michigan University	61	89	25	90	100	5	96	100	5	86	8	100	10	5	3	48	5	Yes
Eastern Michigan University	61	89	25	95	93	5	87	95	5	70	6	100	10	13	5	60	5	Yes
Ferris State University	60	82	20	94	100	5	94	87	5	94	10	100	10	34	5	37	5	No
Marygrove	60	81	20	97	100	5	89	93	5	92	10	100	10	90	5	43	5	Yes
Concordia	59	90	30	91	100	5	67	100	3	77	6	100	10	4	0	59	5	Yes
Siena Heights	58	83	20	96	100	5	96	100	5	84	8	100	10	23	5	52	5	Yes
U of M-Flint	58	82	20	86	100	5	96	100	5	88	8	100	10	10	5	58	5	Yes
Rochester	56	81	20	93	100	5	100	93	5	87	8	100	10	8	3	54	5	Yes
University of Detroit Mercy	56	83	20	94	91	5	98	85	5	75	6	100	10	45	5	45	5	Yes
AT-RISK																		
Saginaw Valley State University	55	83	20	94	100	5	97	99	5	90	10	100	10	4	0	46	5	Yes
Hillsdale	53	83	20	97	100	5	100	100	5	86	8	100	10	0	0	69	5	No
Western Michigan University	53	83	20	92	99	5	96	90	5	92	10	100	10	5	3	29	0	Yes
LOW-PERFORMING																		
Lake Superior State University	34	76	0	87	100	5	100	100	5	68	4	100	10	10	5	35	5	Yes
Adrian	33	78	0	94	100	5	99	100	5	92	10	100	10	8	3	26	0	Yes
Olivet	32	76	0	95	98	5	96	95	5	64	4	100	10	9	3	43	5	Yes
Finlandia	20	66	0	93	33	0	78	33	0	100	10	100	10	0	0	11	0	Yes

¹ MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (College of Creative Studies)

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores for Meeting Higher Education Act Title II Classification Requirement

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) complies with the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II state requirements and the State Board of Education (SBE) expectations by identifying four (4) Title II categories of teacher preparation institutions:

- Exemplary Performance Teacher Preparation
- Satisfactory Performance Teacher Preparation
- At-Risk Teacher Preparation
- Low-Performing Teacher Preparation

The following six criteria will be used for placement of a teacher preparation institution into a Title II performance category as identified above.

PERFORMANCE SCORE RUBRIC: Total points possible: 70

1. Test pass rate (30 points):

Test pass rate shall be the three-year aggregate of all specialty content areas for individuals validated by the institution as ready for the content test (note: not necessarily program completers). The MDE creates a summary score for the institution based upon its aggregate pass rate information on validated (subject to state audit) candidates.

The MDE identifies four test pass rate categories to be used to allocate points (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

- a. 90% or higher = 30 points
- b. 85 - 89% = 25 points
- c. 80 - 84% = 20 points
- d. Below 80% = 0 points

2. Program Review *(10 points):

As part of periodic review or an equivalent accreditation process, a determination is made as to the status of each endorsement program. Full approval = 1, approval suspended by the state (or equivalent accrediting body) = 0**. These scores are totaled and divided by the total number of programs so classified, to determine the percent of programs approved (this is done to avoid penalizing institutions of any particular size or number of programs). The possible range of scores is thus 0 through 100%. The points are awarded as follows (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

95% or more programs approved = 10 points

90 - 94% programs approved = 8

85 - 89% programs approved = 6

80 - 84% programs approved = 4

75 - 79% programs approved = 3

*Periodic review priorities as determined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction will be added to these criteria.

**Note: A program withdrawn by the institution is not included in the calculation of the percent approved.

3. Program Completion (10 points):

The number of candidates who are recommended (or who are eligible for recommendation) by the institution for a teaching certificate within six years of entering a cohort, divided by the total number of candidates admitted into the teacher preparation cohort at or beyond the junior year of a baccalaureate program or at entrance into a post baccalaureate program during a specified academic year. In each case, a cohort will be defined by the number who entered the program (e.g., using 2003-2004 academic year data as the denominator, the six-year completion rate would be calculated based on recommendations during 2008-2009 academic year).

This information is calculated by the institution and subject to state audit. The points are awarded as follows (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

90% = 10 points*

80 - 89% = 8 points

70 - 79% = 6 points

60 - 69% = 4 points

50 - 59% = 2 points

*Note: the maximum point category is set only at 90% to acknowledge that institutions have a responsibility to identify candidates whose commitment or classroom performance is not suitable for the profession, even if academic qualifications that led to program admission are strong. However, over time, it is expected that institutional admission criteria would increasingly reflect institutional experiences of the qualifications, both academic and interpersonal, needed for success in the specific program.

4. Survey of candidates and supervisors (10 points):

A. Survey of candidates: (5 points)

The score will depend on the aggregate results of the survey of candidates completing student teaching regarding their perceived readiness (efficacy) in each of the seven Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT) areas. Since response rate is important to validity of results, the MDE expects institutions to assure that a large proportion of their student teachers complete the survey. The response rate is built into the points awarded in this area as indicated in the following table (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

Student Teachers Response rate:	80-100% Efficacy	70-79% Efficacy	60-69% Efficacy	Below 60% Efficacy
80-100%	5	4	3	0
60-79%	3	2	1	0
Below 60%	0	0	0	0

B. Survey of supervisors: (5 points)

Beginning in 2006-07, institutions are also required to have supervisors of student teachers complete a short survey on the same readiness areas for each student teacher supervised. Validation of the student teachers' perceived efficacy with the perceptions of supervisors makes a stronger case for the institution's impact on teacher readiness. The following table indicates the points awarded for different response rates and efficacy levels (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number).

Supervisors Response Rate:	80-100% Efficacy	70-79% Efficacy	60-69% Efficacy	Below 60% Efficacy
80-100%	5	4	3	0
60-79%	3	2	1	0
Below 60%	0	0	0	0

5. Institutional responsiveness to state needs (10 points):

Some institutions have a mission responsive to state need as shown in their emphasis on providing access to diverse students and/or their emphasis on preparation of teachers in high need areas such as mathematics, science, special education, or other areas that the MDE may identify in its Title II HEA formula.

A. Diversity score (5 points): The 2004-2005 Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicates that less than 10% of Michigan's teaching force is represented by ethnic minorities. Ethnic minority categories are Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American and Pacific Islander, and multi-racial, as used in other higher education national data.

1. Any teacher preparation institution recommending 10% or more minority candidates in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort of individuals) will receive 5 points.
2. Any teacher preparation institution recommending 5 to 9% minority candidates in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort of individuals) will receive 3 points.

B. Preparation of teachers in high need subject areas (5 points):

Any institution recommending 35% or more candidates with content specialty (major or minor-based endorsement) in special education, mathematics, science (i.e., endorsement codes DX, DI, at either elementary or secondary levels), or specific science endorsements (chemistry, physics, biology, earth/space science) at the secondary level, or world languages in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort) will receive 5 points. Other academic subject areas may be added to this list in the future by the MDE based on statewide teacher shortages.

6. Teaching success rate (points to be determined):

This longer term factor is expected to be identified during 2008. Teaching success rate is the number of new teachers from the institution evaluated as satisfactory or better; divided by the total number of all who were placed in Michigan in that focus year and for whom a rating was received, with a minimum of 85% for "Satisfactory" programs. This indicator will be implemented over time; as more systematic information becomes available on new teachers from the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) and from institutional follow up. The formula may change to reflect this new information.

Overall score: A range of 0 to 70 points is currently awarded. The total points will increase as other factors are implemented (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number).

63 (90%) or higher = exemplary
56 to 62 (80% to 89%) = satisfactory
52 to 55 (75% to 79%) = at-risk status
Below 52 = low-performing

Institutions identified as low-performing will have two years with an opportunity for technical assistance from the state to improve before penalties are imposed. Institutions that remain in the at-risk category for two consecutive years will be moved into the low-performing category.

Appeals regarding an institution's performance status will be handled through the Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS). The proposed Michigan Teacher Preparation Research Collaborative will be requested to review this document to determine if further revisions are needed.

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Score Three Year Comparisons						
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Points	Category	Points	Category	Points	Category
Adrian	53	AR	35	LP	33	LP
Albion	61	Sat	70	Ex	63	Ex
Alma	65	Ex	53	AR	66	Ex
Andrews	70	Ex	70	Ex	63	Ex
Aquinas	64	Ex	66	Ex	63	Ex
Calvin	65	Ex	68	Ex	68	Ex
Central Michigan	65	Ex	66	Ex	61	Sat
Concordia	61	Sat	56	Sat	59	Sat
Cornerstone	66	Ex	63	Ex	65	Ex
Eastern Michigan	66	Ex	66	Ex	61	Sat
Ferris State	63	Ex	60	Sat	60	Sat
Grand Valley State	68	Ex	68	Ex	68	Ex
Hillsdale	60	Sat	65	Ex	53	AR
Hope	68	Ex	68	Ex	70	Ex
Lake Superior State	53	AR	33	LP	34	LP
Madonna	68	Ex	63	Ex	66	Ex
Marygrove	34	LP	60	Sat	60	Sat
Michigan State	66	Ex	66	Ex	66	Ex
Michigan Technological	58	Sat	56	Sat	63	Ex
Northern Michigan	63	Ex	63	Ex	65	Ex
Oakland	68	Ex	65	Ex	63	Ex
Olivet	34	LP	34	LP	32	LP
Robert B Miller	N/A		58	Sat	68	Ex
Rochester	56	Sat	58	Sat	56	Sat
Saginaw Valley State	63	Ex	63	Ex	55	AR
Siena Heights	60	Sat	60	Sat	58	Sat
Spring Arbor	68	Ex	63	Ex	63	Ex
UDMercy	36	LP	54	AR	56	Sat
U of M-Ann Arbor	68	Ex	68	Ex	70	Ex
U of M-Dearborn	66	Ex	63	Ex	65	Ex
U of M-Flint	63	Ex	61	Sat	58	Sat
Wayne State	63	Ex	63	Ex	63	Ex
Western Michigan	63	EX	58	Sat	53	AR

AR = At-Risk

Ex = Exemplary

Sat = Satisfactory

LP = Low-Performing

N/A = The TPI was reported under its mentor institution

Teacher Preparation Institutions Corrective Action Status				
INSTITUTION	Years in Corrective Action	Level	* Report Received	Institution Focus
Adrian	2	2	4/30/12	High Needs and MTTC Scores
Finlandia	0	2	N/A	High Needs, Surveys, and MTTC Scores
Hillsdale	0	1	N/A	Diversity and MTTC Scores
Lake Superior State University	3	3	4/25/12	Program Completion, and MTTC Scores
Olivet	2	3	4/30/12	Program Completion, Diversity, and MTTC Scores
Western Michigan University	0	1	N/A	High Needs, Diversity, and MTTC Scores

* Due April 30, 2012

N/A = The institution has just entered into corrective action status, as such a report is not required until next year's report.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

CORRECTIVE ACTION STEPS for AT-RISK AND LOW-PERFORMING TEACHER PREPARATION INSTITUTIONS

Effective with the August 2009 Performance Score Report

Level 1 Corrective Action: At-Risk status, in the first two years of such designation, are required to:

- Notify students admitted to the teacher preparation program in writing of the status of the institution and possible impact on their educational endeavor. The institution must submit a copy of the written notification to the Michigan Department of Education (MDE).
- Complete a needs assessment and teacher preparation plan of improvement using the MDE's templates, within six months of announcement of at-risk status designation.
- Implement improvement plan after review by the MDE.
- Report actions and progress in writing to the MDE at the conclusion of every six months of at-risk status.
- Use available technical assistance by MDE staff and Michigan Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE), Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Michigan (AICUM), and/or other external consultants.
- Withdraw, after one academic year of less than satisfactory status, from serving as a mentor to any higher education institution seeking State Board of Education (SBE) approval to offer teacher preparation; this includes informing the MDE and mentee institution in writing.
- Acknowledge ineligibility to apply for Higher Education Act Title II subpart A (3) grants; however, existing grants may be continued.
- Move to satisfactory within two years or move to low-performing status and Level 2 Corrective Action.

Level 2 Corrective Action: Low-Performing status or At-Risk status (after two years at Level 1) are required to do all required activities in Level 1 plus:

- Notify the institution's national accrediting agency in writing of its status as part of a regular annual update to the agency and provide a copy of the notification to the MDE.
- Work with a qualified external consultant to execute the improvement plan and provide the MDE with information about the consultant's qualifications.
- Develop an agreement to work with a Michigan mentor institution, in satisfactory or better standing, to function as model for structural and process improvement and to recommend teacher candidates and others for certification if the need to do so occurs.
- Withdraw new programs being reviewed for initial teacher preparation approval. Approved programs being reviewed for alignment to new SBE standards may continue in the review process.
- Attain satisfactory status within two years (if low-performing and Level 2

Corrective Action was the initial performance designation), otherwise move to Level 3 Corrective Action; or

- Attain satisfactory status within one year at Level 2 Corrective Action (if at-risk and Level 1 Corrective Action was the initial performance designation), otherwise move to Level 3 Corrective Action.

Level 3 Corrective Action: Institutions beginning their third year in Low-Performing status or those institutions in initial status as At-Risk now beginning second year in Low-Performing status are required to do all activities listed in Levels 1 and 2 plus:

- Immediately stop admission to all specialty programs with Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) test scores below 80% pass rate.
- Provide the MDE with current data, if available, documenting recent improvement in elements that comprise the TPI performance score calculation. For example, a current increase in the aggregate MTTC passing percentage for the most immediate one-year reporting period may be presented to show updated improvement from a less than 80 percent passing percentage documented in the three-year cumulative report used in calculating the performance score.
- Provide the OPPS with three strengths or recent improvements made, which will be highlighted in the TPI performance score report prepared for the MDE and maintained on the MDE website.
- Work with the MDE to nominate a Committee of Scholars to advise the SBE on the conditions under which the institution's approval could be maintained for teacher preparation or recommend a phase-out timeline if the SBE decides to rescind the institution's approval.
- Comply with the SBE and its sole discretion to either continue an institution's approval status for recommending teacher candidate to the MDE based on the SBE's determination that the institution has documented improvement since its original at-risk or low-performing designation; or rescind the institution's approval for recommending teacher candidates to the MDE.
- Work with the MDE to phase out the teacher preparation program, subsequent to the SBE'S decision to rescind the institution's approval status, on a timeline recommended by the Committee of Scholars.
- Assist teacher preparation students to complete teacher preparation at other Michigan approved institutions, including, but not limited to:
 - Notifying students of the timeline by which the teacher preparation program will phase out at the institution.
 - Completing necessary paperwork for cost-free transfer of records, course work, and field experiences to a new Michigan institution.
 - Completing necessary paperwork for cost-free transfer of financial aid to an approved institution.
- If the institution's "performance score" improves to satisfactory or higher the year that it is in level 3 corrective actions, the institution's approval will be reinstated including all previously approved subject area programs.

NOTE: 2009-10 is the first year that any institution will be assigned to level 1 or level 2 corrective action, which means the earliest an institution would be designated as level 3 would occur during summer 2011.

2010-11 High Need Endorsement Reporting								
Institution	Number of Candidates Eligible for Recommendation	High Need Endorsements					Total High Need Endorsements	High Need Endorsement Percentage *
		Special Education	Mathematics	Science		World Language, ESL, and Bilingual		
				Integrated	Single			
Adrian College	27	0	4	1	0	2	7	26%
Albion College	22	0	2	1	0	1	4	18%
Alma College	48	0	12	2	5	2	22	46%
Andrews University	18	0	5	1	0	5	11	61%
Aquinas College	136	21	4	1	4	35	65	48%
Calvin College	183	28	18	21	5	26	98	54%
Central Michigan University	637	80	91	83	33	20	307	48%
Concordia University	17	0	7	0	2	1	10	59%
Cornerstone University	61	5	7	7	1	8	28	46%
Eastern Michigan University	630	142	106	66	48	14	376	60%
Ferris State University	125	12	17	8	7	2	46	37%
Finlandia University	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	11%
Grand Valley State University	458	62	52	40	46	33	233	51%
Hillsdale College	36	0	10	3	7	5	25	69%
Hope College	142	35	20	6	5	17	83	58%
Lake Superior State University	31	0	6	3	2	0	11	35%
Madonna University	163	70	11	6	2	2	91	56%
Marygrove College	40	6	9	1	1	0	17	43%
Michigan State University	455	75	68	40	46	39	268	59%
Michigan Technological University	9	0	4	1	5	0	10	111%
Northern Michigan University	120	9	17	23	19	10	78	65%
Oakland University	458	78	85	39	25	56	253	55%
Olivet College	46	8	6	6	0	0	20	43%
Robert B. Miller College	13	4	1	1	0	0	6	46%
Rochester College	13	0	5	1	1	0	7	54%
Saginaw Valley State University	602	116	92	24	31	12	275	46%
Siena Heights University	31	9	4	0	1	2	16	52%
Spring Arbor University	87	17	8	4	5	2	36	41%
University of Detroit Mercy	49	10	8	4	0	0	22	45%
University of Michigan	251	0	73	18	46	30	167	67%
University of Michigan-Dearborn	121	9	75	38	13	1	136	112%
University of Michigan-Flint	132	43	16	5	7	6	77	58%
Wayne State University	318	60	38	22	16	10	146	46%
Western Michigan University	589	51	50	11	34	22	168	29%

* Percentages greater than 100% occur when eligible candidates hold more than one high needs endorsement.